DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 121 741 SP 010 002

AUTHOR DeFlaminis, John A.
TITLE Teacher Responses to Classroom Misbehavior: Influence Methods in a Perilous Equilibrium.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Class Management; *Discipline; *Misbehavior; Power Structure; *Teacher Influence; *Teacher Response; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a study which had a twofold purpose. The first was to determine which methods of influence were used by teachers to control pupils who exhibited various types of disruptive misbehavior. The second purpose of this study was to determine why teachers chose those specific methods of control. Influence was considered from the perspective of the person being influenced (the student). Six methods of influence were defined and utilized: authority, coercion, situational and relational contract, persuasion, and manipulation. These six influence methods were grouped into three categories of influence (unwilling, willing, and unwitting) which were used to describe how the teacher's judgment was substituted for that of the students. Eighty-five certified classroom teachers from Eugene, Oregon, comprised the sample for this study. This sample covered grade levels 1-12. While the school district selected the schools in the sample, volunteers were recruited from the faculties to complete the instrument (Influence Inventory). A stratified random sample of 40 teachers was selected from this population to participate in a follow-up interview. The Influence Inventory contained 16 hypothetical situations to which teachers responded. Each situation contained a combination of four facets: (1) duration of disruptive misbehavior, (2) students' motivation to learn, (3) sex of student, and (4) student's ability group. A follow-up interview was used in this study to elicit the teacher's subjective reasons for using the methods of influence chosen. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED121741

SP

TEACHER RESPONSES TO CLASSROOM MISBEHAVIOR: INFLUENCE METHODS IN A PERILOUS EQUILIBRIUM

by

John A. DeFlaminis

University of Louisville

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John A. DeFlaminis

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Presentation Paper
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, 1976

THE PURPOSES OF THE STUDY*

This study had a twofold purpose. The first was to determine which methods of influence were used by teachers to control pupils who exhibited various types of disruptive misbehavior. Various pupil, teacher, and behavior characteristics were also examined to find out whether teachers differentiated between these characteristics in their selection of influence methods.

The second purpose of this study was to determine why teachers chose certain specific methods of control. Teachers' perceptions about misbehavior, student characteristics, and other factors which help to define the nature of the influence situation were elicited to better understand the teachers' frame of reference.

---

*This study represents the author's doctoral dissertation completed in August, 1975 at the University of Oregon. This summary includes few of the verbatim teacher responses used in the original work to fulfill the second purpose stated here. However, most of the responses are summarized in the findings. A more complete article, which will include these responses, is in preparation for future publication.

SP 010 002

THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

THE PROBLEM OF CONTROL IN SCHOOLS

The matter of classroom control is not often stated as a purpose of the schools, but it is a readily apparent function of those institutions. Historically, the concern for control has evolved from the universal attendance laws and the important socialization role that the school plays in our society. The public, whose taxes support the schools and who exerts considerable influence on the schools, repeatedly affirms the importance of disciplining and controlling students.

No other institution—except church, perhaps—exposes the child to as much repetitiveness and ritualistic action as the school (Jackson, 1968). The classroom is the locus of this action. The teacher, pressed with the problems of "managing crowd behavior," often finds that "order and control are intimately tied to . . . instructional objectives (Pellegrin, 1971:35). Since instruction is often impossible without order and control, a teacher's ability to control a class is quite often equated with his ability to teach (Gordon, 1957).

The maintenance of order and control is rated at the top of problems that teachers consider major difficulties (Dobson, Goldenberg, Elsom, 1972). The norms and values of the teacher subculture emphasize the need for strong control of students (Hoy, 1969). Since the teacher's professional success and status with peers often rest on the ability to control pupils, it is not surprising that the ability to maintain discipline or control in the classroom was mentioned as a major cause

of anxiety among beginning teachers and, somewhat less dramatically, in the causes of anxiety among experienced teachers (Coates and Thoresen, 1974).

Teachers maintain order and control in classrooms through many different means. One means, the methods of influence used when misbehavior occurs, was the critical concern of this study.

THE METHODS OF INFLUENCE

"Influence," in this study, was defined as "an interpersonal transaction in which one person acts in such a way as to change the behavior of another in some intended fashions" (Katz and Kahn, 1966: 218). While influence may be seen and defined from many points of view, this study followed Gilman (1962) and perceived influence from the point of view of the influencee (the person being influenced). The definitions, therefore, used the students' frame of reference as a focal point.

The Categories of Influence

The methods of influence used in this study employed the terms unwilling, willing, and unwitting to describe how the teacher's judgment is substituted for the student's. The following delineation depicts the methods of influence that were included under each category:

Unwilling category	Authority Coercion
Willing category	Persuasion Situational Contract Relational Contract
Unwitting category	Manipulation

Definitions of Specific Influence Methods*

The definitions of the specific influence methods are listed below:

1. Coercion
   The unwilling substitution by the student of the teacher's judgment for his own. This is accomplished through the use of some kind of force. Students accept the teacher's judgment in place of their own as the lesser of two undesirable alternatives.
2. Legitimate Authority
   The unwilling substitution by the student of the teacher's judgment for his own. This is accomplished by the teachers by virtue of his/her greater status in the school and by the implicit threat of subsequent coercion.
3. Situational Contract
   The willing substitution by the student of the teacher's judgment for his own. This is accomplished by an immediate exchange between the two parties whereby the teacher bestows some benefit to the student in exchange for more acceptable behavior.
4. Relational Contract
   The willing substitution by the student of the teacher's judgment for his own. This is accomplished by virtue of a long standing, reciprocal arrangement between the two parties whereby the teacher has bestowed upon the student benefits in advance of the misbehavior. Students are expected to comply with the teacher's wishes or give up the right to continued benefits.
5. Persuasion
   The willing substitution by the student of the teacher's judgment for his own. This is accomplished by virtue of the fact that the teacher's judgment is understood by the student to be logically more desirable for him than his own.
6. Manipulation
   The unwitting substitution by the student of the teacher's judgment for his own. This is accomplished by causing the

---

*These definitions are modifications and elaborations on definitions from the social science literature. Coercion, persuasion, and manipulation were adopted from Gilman's work (1962:107) while legitimate authority has been drawn from Rosenberg and Pearlin (1962). Both Gilman and Rosenberg and Pearlin use contract (the latter call it contractual power) in the sense of "gaining compliance with one's will by providing rewards or advantages in return" (Gilman, 1962: 107). Situational contract largely conforms to this definition by stressing the immediate situation. Relational contract, however, is an attempt to operationalize Gouldner's (1960) Norm of Reciprocity which is more of a long standing relationship—mutually gratifying, reciprocal, and self-perpetuating—and is emphasized as the basis for compliance.

student to perceive only those elements of the environment the teachers would have him see. Force, threat of force, contract, and persuasion are not involved.

Research has focused on both the collective effects of each category (unwilling, willing, and unwitting) and the individual effects of each method in each category. While the major foci of this study were the collective effects of each category, the individual methods were discussed.

The frequency of use of the methods of influence was the first purpose of this study. Several studies suggested that the unwilling methods (authority and coercion) were more prevalent than any other methods in the public schools. Shipman (1968) cited both American and English studies describing the use of coercion in schools. The 1973 Survey of Disciplinary Measures in high schools and junior high schools in Oregon (Acheson, 1973) further revealed that over 75 percent of the twenty measures listed were unwilling methods.

The Unwilling Methods

Unwilling methods, in general, were found to be counterproductive to maintaining appropriate classroom behavior. When high levels of authority and coercion were used, disruptive classroom behavior increased markedly (Thomas, Becker, and Armstrong, 1968). Specifically, authority may have a negative impact on the development of the child since the "use of such a means of influence can be degrading to the self-esteem of the less powerful and tend to maintain their inferior role" (Raven and Kruglanski, 1970:75). This condition should be highly undesirable in schools where self-control, moral development, and responsible independence are supposed to be valued.

The use of coercion by the teacher to influence students' moral commitments have also been found to be counterproductive (Bidwell, 1972). Furthermore, the teacher who uses coercion as a method of influence may serve as a model on which pupils may shape their behavior (Becker, 1964; Sears and Dowley, 1963; Stephens, 1973). Patterson (1974) found that the problem child was twice as likely to persist in his behavior in response to coercion. Finally, coercion correlates negatively with learning (Jamieson and Thomas, 1974; Gnagey, 1965; Spady, 1973a; Redl and Wattenburg, 1959). Spady (1973a:15) succinctly sums up a compelling argument for the exclusion of coercion in schools, particularly when he states that:

> . . . if the ultimate goal of teaching is to stimulate the students' commitment to engage in learning activity, attempts to deal with students via coervice means are likely to be counterproductive, since coercion usually induces only involuntary compliance and resentment against the controlling figure.

The Willing Methods

The willing methods, on the other hand, offer a greater likelihood that self-control will result through an expansion of the "child's own cognitive resources for internalized control of its behavior" (Aronfreed, 1968:316). The child is more likely to accept influence when it is congruent with his own value system (Kelman, 1971).

Persuasion is "commonly advocated as most suited to a democratic, or rational social system" (Cartwright, 1965:18). While it "places enormous demands on the teacher's influence and persuasiveness" (Spady, 1973:5), it offers the unique opportunity for both the teacher and student to add to or modify their reference frames.

For this reason, persuasion produces the longest lasting attitude change of all the methods (Raven and Kruglanski, 1970).

Contracts are willing methods in the sense that students have a choice whether to accept the immediate exchange (situational contract) or the reciprocal arrangement (relational contract). These contract methods differ distinctly from persuasion in that to some degree "each contracting party influences the behavior of the other" (Rosenberg and Pearlin, 1962:340). Staub (1972) views contract in a developmental sense—explicated by Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1969) —who advocate this method as both an effective mode of influence and a factor contributive to the child's moral development.

The Unwitting Method

The unwitting method of influence, manipulation, does not abridge the student's freedom since he is never aware that he is being influenced. While this factor is certainly a good reason to prefer it over the unwilling methods, it does not contribute as much to the growth and development and learning needs of the subject as the willing methods. The "unwitting" nature of this method most often renders it neutral to all effects that the other methods cause.

Growth, Development, and Methods of Influence: A Closing Perspective

The method of influence (or control) is a critical factor in moral growth and development. Loubser (1970) explains that the significant variable is the extent to which the method of influence gives the child an opportunity to experience the necessity of control and to exercise this control himself. When decisions are made for children

rather than with children, the development of moral judgment is not furthered. A major research effort undertaken by the Center for Social Organizations of Schools at Johns Hopkins University has suggested that control may also be counterproductive to the development of personal and social maturity.

THE HUMAN FACTOR—CHARACTERISTICS OF PEOPLE

Behavior Characteristics

This study identified only disruptive behavior to elicit the teachers' choice of influence methods. "Disruptive behavior" was defined as "that behavior which interferes with learning activities, prevents the class from functioning effectively and calls for the teacher's immediate, corrective action."

A duration (time) dimension of the disruptive misbehavior, used by Webster (1968:46), was also employed in this study. Cases of temporary disruptive misbehavior "tend to happen only once, or at least infrequently, but they are severe enough to require immediate attention since the classroom atmosphere is disrupted by them." Persistent disruptive misbehavior also requires immediate attention but is "more serious because it tends to persist."

Student Characteristics

Three student characteristics were also used in this study: ability, motivation, and sex. Each characteristic is briefly discussed and the operational definitions are given in the following paragraphs.

"Ability" means "all the psychological conditions needed to perform an activity" (Meili, 1972:5). Since ability is operationally defined

by the activity with which it is associated, a high-ability student in this study was "one who obtains high scores on intelligence and achievement tests and earns good grades and favorable teacher recommendations" (Meili, 1972).

Many students who fail are behavior problems. Their failure may affect already less-than-adequate self-concepts which might increase their problems. Teacher, through socialization and their own identity needs, may perceive and expect different results from low- and high-ability students. These perceptions and expectations seem to take on elements of a self-fulfilling prophecy in the classroom as teachers treat students differently. Fuchs (1969:105-106) concludes that "in the 'better' classes there is a greater stress placed on academic achievement; in the poorer classes there is a greater stress placed on the maintenance of order and a lower expectation of achievement."

The research literature is by no means clear about what motivation is and how one acquires it. The sense in which motivation was intended in this study—motivation to learn—was similar to that used by Kounin (1970:41). A "motivated student" was operationally defined as "a student who characteristically is attentive, interested in learning, and conscientious in completing assignments."

Inattentiveness, indifference to schoolwork, and reluctance to work except under compulsion are matters that annoy teachers. These occurrences are regarded as challenges to teachers' roles as "leaders, disciplinarians, and instructors" (Charters, 1963:737). Three of the five reasons student teachers reported a negative

attitude were related to problems of motivation (Peck, 1971). Peck (1971:63) also reported that the student teachers "tended strongly to change in the direction of more authoritarian attitudes."

Girls receive more affection and less physical punishment than boys (Becker, 1964; Bronfenbrenner, 1972). This finding may be one reason boys learn early to be more "aggressive, independent, and outspoken, and to avoid displays of emotion" while girls "are quickly nudged toward conformity and passivity" (Peltier, 1972:501-502). This situation poses problems for boys in school as their aggressive behavior leads them to receive "the lion's share of the schools "official' forms of disapproval" (Lee, 1973:13). While boys' behavior is the cause of some difficulty for teachers, paradoxically, it is precisely that behavior that teachers prefer (Ricks, 1973).

Teacher Characteristics

Seven demographic characteristics of teachers were discussed and predictions were made from the review of the literature. They were: sex, amount of teacher education, level of teaching, individual school identification, age, experience in a school, and total years as a teacher.

THE RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Nature of the Sample

Eighty-nine certified classroom teachers from Eugene, Oregon, (District 4-J), comprised the sample for this study. This sample covered grade levels 1-12 and was almost equally distributed among the three school levels (Elementary-34; Junior High-23; and High

School-28). Five elementary, two junior high, and two high schools were involved. There were fifty-three female and thirty-two male teachers in the sample.

The schools and the participants were not drawn at random. After the initial contacts with the school system in which approval was secured, the school district selected the schools that would comprise the sample. Volunteers were then recruited from the faculties to complete the instrument (Influence Inventory). A stratified random sample of forty teachers was selected from this population to participate in a follow-up interview.

Instrumentation

The Influence Inventory contained sixteen hypothetical situations. Each situation contained a combination of the four facets of this study discussed in the last section:

A. Duration of disruptive misbehavior—two types
(a_1 - temporary; a_2 - persistent)

B. Students' motivation to learn
(b_1 - motivated; b_2 - non-motivated)

C. Sex of student
(c_1 - male c_2 - female)

D. Student's ability group
(d_1 - high; d_2 - low)

The Cartesian product of the four facets, AxBxCxD, produced the sixteen subuniverses (2x2x2x2 = 16) which comprised the major elements

of the sixteen hypothetical situations. The following matrix visually displays those sixteen situations:

Hypothetical Situation Matrix

Student Characteristics			Disruptive Classroom Misbehaviors: Duration of Misbehavior	
Ability Group	Motivation to Learn	Sex	Temporary	Persistent
HIGH	Motivated	Male	1	9
		Female	2	10
	Non-Motivated	Male	3	11
		Female	4	12
LOW	Motivated	Male	5	13
		Female	6	14
	Non-Motivated	Male	7	15
		Female	8	16

Operational definitions were used in a mapping sentence to assure a smooth, descriptive quality that would maintain a teacher's interest.

Two Q-Sorts were completed by twelve local teachers to obtain the operational definitions (illustrative practices) of the methods of influence and the disruptive misbehaviors used in the Inventory. The

completion of this development work enabled the author to substitute highly agreed upon, teacher-determined operational definitions for more esoteric, formal definitions.

The hypothetical situations were followed by six groups of illustrative practices which operationally defined the six methods of influence. The teacher was then asked for each hypothetical situation to indicate a method "suggested by or contained in" those illustrative practices.

The Influence Interview

A follow-up interview was used in this study to elicit the teacher's subjective reasons for using the methods of influence chosen in the hypothetical situations. It was a standardized (structured) interview which posed questions to the respondents in a prescribed sequence, varying only when the responses differed from the instrument answers given or when an occasional answer needed further probing. For this reason, the interview might also be described as a semi-scheduled interview.

The interview utilized the tabulated data from each respondent's completed Inventory which was recorded on a data-summary worksheet. The interviews were also used to explain the findings of the smallest space analysis. The respondents' own rationales, plus the author's summary descriptions, explain why teachers chose the methods they did for each student in light of his behavioral characteristics.

Analysis Procedures

The analysis of the findings first considered the modal frequency

distribution of the methods employed by teachers in each hypothetical situation. The demographic data of the teachers were then analyzed using two bivariate measures of association, lambda (λ) and eta (η), and one test of significance, chi-square (χ^2).

Finally, smallest space analysis was used to build a model of the structural analysis of the data to consider the relations within and between the hypothetical situations. Throughout this analysis, the results of the interview were used to explain the findings by presenting the teachers' stated reasons for their use of certain methods of influence.

THE FINDINGS

Frequency of Method Use

The unwilling category had the greatest frequency of responses. In nine out of fifteen hypothetical situations, the unwilling methods were chosen. These responses to the Influence Inventory supported the educational literature and survey suggestions that authority and coercion (unwilling category) were the most often used methods of influence.

The Unwilling Methods—Findings and Rationales

Teachers liked authority best as a method, with persuasion a very close second. The expeditious and non-interrupting qualities of authority were the major reasons given by teachers for its preference. These findings supported the Stebbins description (1970) of the teachers' need for expeditious treatment and Sylwester's explanation (1961) of the teachers' need to react to the immediate situation.

While the unwilling methods were the least time consuming, coercion was not often used and was identified as the least-liked method. Some teachers seemed to realize the negative impact of this method on interpersonal relations, learning, and growth. Others saw some forms of coercion as an admission of personal failure which abridged their sense of professional pride and authority.

The Willing Methods—Findings and Rationales

Persuasion was the best-liked willing method and was considered (equal to authority) as the method which works best. Despite these evaluations, it is not used often in class because it takes time. Once again, this finding tended to support Sylwester's observation (1961) that while teachers know "what they should do," they tend to react to the immediate situation, hoping to come back to the "right method" when the classroom is running more smoothly.

The other willing methods—situational and relational contract—were second to coercion as the least-liked methods and most often mentioned as the methods were never used. While some forms of coercion were criticized for showing too much strength, teachers felt that contract showed too much weakness. These methods were most often characterized as bribes.

Throughout the interviews, the discussion of methods tended to assume the intuitive, idiosyncratic qualities of each individual. Like Jackson's interviews with the fifty outstanding teachers (1968:144), these interviews were characterized by "an absence of technical terms" and by "conceptual simplicity" of the teachers' talk. Only

in about 10 percent of the interviews did teachers mention any of the leading writers in this area. The responses confirmed an intuitive approach, "tempered by years of practical experience" (Jackson, 1968: 145). The teachers tended to "rely on precedent and common sense much more than . . . on research findings as justifications for their practices" (Pellegrin, 1971:9).

The Sequences and Patterns

While the Inventory instructions requested that teachers indicate a single response to the hypothetical situations, many used the available space to explain their responses and to indicate other methods that preceded or followed their responses. Fifteen different sequences of responses emerged from the interviews. Persuasion was contained in every sequence. Two-thirds of the sequences contained authority, while more than two-thirds contained coercion. One-fifth contained manipulation.

Several sequences occurred so frequently that they emerged as patterns. The most common feature among the patterns was the tendency of persuasion to follow the other three methods mentioned (authority, coercion, and manipulation), especially with persistent disruptive misbehavior. Eighty-two percent of the teachers used methods of influence in sequence with persistent disruptive misbehavior. The teachers (64 percent) tended to ignore or use authority alone with temporary disruptive misbehavior. This finding once again affirmed the teachers' tendency to respond to the immediate situation by applying an expeditious and easy method, if any method was applied at all. The more time-consuming methods were reserved for persistent problems and used at some later time.

Teacher Demographic Characteristics

It was predicted that male teachers and less-educated teachers would use more unwilling methods than their counterparts. No elevated lambda (λ) coefficients were found in either the sex of teacher or the amount of teacher-education characteristics. Two significant chi-squares (χ^2), however, were observed for the latter characteristic. An examination of those situations revealed that less-educated teachers used less unwilling methods—a finding directly opposite to what was predicted.

One elevated lambda coefficient was found in each of the teacher/school characteristics—level of teaching and individual school identification. Many hypothetical situations, however, were found to be significant at or beyond the .05 level for each characteristic. As predicted, secondary school teachers used more authority methods of influence in sequence and coercion with students than their elementary counterparts. The teachers at the junior high school level, however, employed the greatest frequencies of unwilling methods to influence students. Much between-school variance was observed among schools in the frequency of the categories of methods used. This finding suggested that certain schools might exert some influence in the teachers' choice of influence methods.

A positive relationship was predicted between the age of the teacher and the use of the unwilling methods. The correlation ratios, etas (η), were reasonably high for most situations, reducing error in prediction substantially from 30 to 40 percent. The prediction was not confirmed since a bi-modal relationship was found in most

situations with the highest percentages in the lowest and highest age ranges.

The highest frequency of use of the unwilling methods throughout the teachers' experience in a school was predicted for the first few years. Knowledge of the teachers' experience was found to reduce the error of prediction from 31 to 55 percent. While the data tended to confirm the prediction, the low response frequencies in some later categories made interpretation quite difficult.

The final teacher characteristics, total years as a teacher, was predicted to be bi-modal; i.e., the first and last years were expected to contain the highest frequencies of the unwilling methods. The etas (η) ranged from .465 to .670 and showed a very high proportional reduction in error of prediction. The data tended to confirm the prediction. Once again, the small numbers of respondents in some categories made the evidence less than overwhelming.

The Smallest Space Analysis

The smallest space analysis revealed that the most dramatic and immediate distinction was the separation of the first eight hypothetical situations from the last eight. Situations 1 to 8 share the temporary disruptive misbehavior facet, and 9 to 16 share the persistent disruptive misbehavior facet.

The two durations of misbehavior were distributed unevenly throughout the categories of methods. The unwilling category contained more temporary disruptive situations than any other category. This was explained by recalling the teachers' preference for fast action

and less time-consuming methods to deal with this type of misbehavior.

Temporary disruptive misbehavior by a low-ability, motivated student was more gently treated than the same misbehavior by a high-ability, motivated student. Apparently, some teachers were "quicker to be disappointed with the high ability child" and perhaps were "more demanding" (Interview 31) and applied more unwilling methods of influence.

While low-ability, motivated students might have received more gentle treatment when they occasionally misbehaved, the tables turned when they persistently disrupted the classroom. Under these conditions the high-ability, motivated student received the more willing methods of influence. While a temporary transgression may be allowed, low-ability students "can't afford the time to act up" (Interview 2) on a persistent basis. The interviews tended to reveal that the group labels apparently fulfilled Fuch's prophecy (1969) that some teachers distinguished between the two groups. Persuasion and reason were more appropriate for the high group, while action and coercion might be better understood by the low group.

With the exception of the patterns of responses to persistent disruptive misbehaviors, teachers were more in agreement over motivation than any other facet in this study. The smallest space analysis revealed that teachers in this study overwhelmingly used the unwilling methods with non-motivated students. Regardless of duration of behavior, 75 percent of the hypothetical situations

which contained non-motivated students had unwilling methods responses.

The interviews tended to confirm Charters (1963), who explained that inattentiveness and indifference to school and a reluctance to work except under compulsion annoy teachers. The non-motivated student presents one of the biggest threats to the teacher's self-image and classroom security. While many teacher probably agreed that "90 percent of behavior problems occur with the non-motivated students" (Interview 6), the same number probably did not know how the student could be motivated.

The least important factor in the teachers' frame of reference was the sex of the student. Only non-motivated, low-ability girls were treated differently and tended to receive more willing treatment. The interaction effects of the low-ability and female facets probably combined to produce an increased emphasis on more willing than unwilling methods. This idea was supported by other findings in the smallest space analysis.

SOME CLOSING RECAPITULATIONS

In conclusion, the author would simply like to list some findings of this study. Some of these findings affirm other research discussed at length in several parts of this paper and the original study. Others were revealed in the course of the original study. These findings suggest that the methods of influence, like Waller's school (1932:10), may be in a "perilous equilibrium." Threatened by their very use, some methods may elicit reactions that could overturn them instantly. While these methods and findings may not

be startling to the educator, they may be, nevertheless, counterproductive to the learning, growth and development of students, many research findings, stated educational values, and teacher/classroom efforts. For these reasons they are highlighted here:

1. Authority and coercion (unwilling category) were the most frequently used methods of influence.

2. Authority was liked best.

3. While coercion seemed to be viewed by some teachers as counterproductive, it is rejected as a method by others principally on the basis of personal pride and his abridgement of the teacher's authority.

4. While teachers want to maintain influence and authority over pupils, they rejected the contract methods primarily because students exact some influence from teachers in return.

5. Persuasion was identified as the method that works best. While this is known by teachers, it seems to be used less than the unwilling methods.

6. Teachers seemed to possess a behavior set—a readiness to act to arrest any behavior thought to be disruptive. Administrators, peers, and the classroom structure appear to exert considerable pressure on teachers to maintain this set.

7. The individual school in some way seemed to exert an influence on the teachers' choice of influence methods.

8. Teachers relief on precedent and common sense rather than research findings to explain their actions in the classroom.

9. Less-educated teachers tended to use less unwilling methods of influence than those who had had more education.

10. During the later school years (junior high and high school) where reason is more developed and growth and development requires more independence, more unwilling methods were used in the classroom.

11. At certain ages, levels of experience, and years as a teacher, more unwilling methods were used.

12. Lack of motivation was most annoying to teachers. More unwilling methods were used with non-motivated students

(with more teacher agreement) than any other student characteristic.

13. Some forms of stereotyping were found with the ability characteristic. The low-ability student was viewed by some teachers as needing more direct, firm action (unwilling methods) than the high-ability student.

14. Since the willing methods (primarily persuasion) were most often used in sequence, they are probably used even less often than the frequency data suggest.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acheson, Keith. "Survey of Disciplinary Measures" in Quarterly Report, Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council, College of Education, University of Oregon, Vol. 14, No. 1, Fall, 1973.

Aronfreed, Justin. Conduct and Conscience: The Socialization of Internalized Control over Behaviour. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Becker, Wesley C. "Consequences of Different Kinds of Parental Discipline" Hoffman, Martin L., and Hoffman, Lois W. (eds.), in Review of Child Development Research, Vol. 1 New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.

Bidwell, Charles E. "School and Socialization for Moral Commitment." Interchange, Vol. 3, No. 4, 1972.

Brehm, Jack W. Responses to Loss of Freedom: A Theory of Psychological Reactance. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1972.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Socialization and Social Class Through Time and Space" in Maccoby, E. E.; Newcomb, T. M.; and Hartley, E. L. (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, 1958, pp. 400-425.

Cartwright, Dorwin. "Influence, Leadership, Control" in James G. March (ed.), Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Charters, W. W., Jr. "The Social Background of Teaching" in N. L. Gage (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Coates, Thomas J., and Thoresen, Carl E. Teacher Anxiety: A Review With Recommendation Research and Development Memorandum No. 123, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, School of Education, Stanford: Stanford University, April, 1974.

Fuchs, Estelle. Teachers Talk: Views from Inside City Schools. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1969.

Gilman, Glenn. "An Inquiry into the Nature and Use of Authority" in Mason Haire (ed.), Organization Theory in Industrial Practice: A Symposium of the Foundation for Research on Human Behaviour. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.

Gnagey, William J. Controlling Classroom Misbehavior. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1965.

Gordon, C. Wayne. The Social System of the High School. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement." American Sociological Review, 25, April, 1960.

Jackson, Philip W. Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Jamieson, David W., and Thomas, Kenneth W. "Power and Conflict in the Student-Teacher Relationship." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 10, No. 3, 1974.

Katz, Daniel, and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Kelman, Herbert C. "Compliance, Identification, and Internalization: Three Processes of Attitude Change" in Hinton, B., and Reitz, H. J. (eds.), Groups and Organizations. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1971.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "State and Sequence: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Socialization" in D. Goslin (ed.), Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Kounin, Jacob S. Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

Lee, Patrick C. "The Early Classroom Experience: Masculine or Feminine." Perspectives on Education. Teachers College, University, Vol. VI, No. 3, Fall, 1973.

Loubser, Jan J. "The Contribution of Schools to Moral Development: A Working Paper in the Theory of Action." Interchange, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970.

Meili, R. "Abilities: A Conceptual Account" in Eysenck, H. J., and Arnold, W. (eds.), Encyclopedia of Psychology, Vol. 1. New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.

Peck, Robert F., and Rucker, James A. Research on Teacher Education; Research and Development and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, July, 1971.

Pellegrin, Roland J. "Schools as Work Organizations" (Preliminary Draft) in Robert Dubin, ed., Handbook of Work, Organization, and Society. New York: Rand McNally & Co., 1971.

Peltier, Gary L. "Sex Differences in the School: Problem and Proposed Solution" in Barnard, Harold W., and Huckins, Wesley C. (eds.), Exploring Human Development: Interdisciplinary Readings. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972.

Piaget, Jean. The Moral Judgment of the Child. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1932.

Raven, Bertram H., and Kruglanski, Arie W. "Conflict and Power" in Swingle, Paul (ed.), The Structure of Conflict. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Redl, Fritz, and Wattenburg, William W. Mental Hygiene in Teaching: Second Edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1959.

Ricks, Frances A., and Pyke, Sandra W. "Teacher Perceptions and Attitudes that Foster or Maintain Sex Role Differences." Interchange, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1973.

Rosenberg, Morris, and Pearlin, Leonard. "Power Orientations in the Mental Hospital." Human Relations, Vol. 15, 1962.

Sears, Pauline S., and Dowley, Edith M. "Research on Teaching in the Nursery School" in Goge, N. L. (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963.

Shipman, M. D. The Sociology of the School. London: Longmans, Green, 1968.

Spady, William G. "Authority, Conflict, and Teacher Effectiveness." The Educational Researcher, Vol. 2, No. 1, January, 1973.

_____. "The Authority System of the School and Student Unrest: A Theoretical Exploration" (A Revised Draft) in 1974 Yearbook on Education; C. Wayne Gordon (ed.), National Study for the Study of Education, 1974 (February, 1973).

Staub, Ervin. "Instigation to Goodness: The Role of Social Norms and Interpersonal Influence." Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 28, November 3, 1972.

Stebbins, Robert A. "The Meaning of Disorderly Behavior: Teacher Definitions of a Classroom Situation." Sociology of Education, Vol. 44, Spring, 1970.

Stephens, Thomas M. "Using Reinforcement and Social Modeling with Delinquent Youth." Review of Educational Research, Vol. 43, No. 3, Summer, 1973.

Sylwester, Robert Alfred. "Intermediate Grade Pupils' Opinions About Disciplinary Practices Teachers Commonly Employ in Meeting Classroom Behaviour Arrogances." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, June, 1961.

Thomas, Don R.; Becker, Wesley C.; and Armstrong, Marianne. "Production and Elimination of Disruptive Classroom Behaviour by Systematically Varying Teacher's Behavior" in Miles, Matthew M., and Charters, W. W. Jr. (eds.), Learning in Social Settings. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.

Waller, Willard. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1932.

Webster, Staten W. Discipline in the Classroom. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1968.